REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

According to the Office Action mailed November 21, 2003, claims 1-21 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim (U.S. Patent No. 6,486,919). Claims 1-21 remain pending. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims.

I. Rejection of claims 1-21 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

The Office Action states that claims 1-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim (U.S. Patent No. 6,486,919). Applicant respectfully disagrees as explained below.

First, claim 1 recites, "a clock signal generator that is configured to produce multiple horizontal clock signals in response to the horizontal flyback signal, wherein each multiple horizontal clock signal has a different phase with respect to one another." The Office Action suggests that because Kim has an input CLK signal generated from a clock signal generator (not shown), fig. 3, this limitation of claim 1 is met. Applicant respectfully disagrees. As stated in the Office Action, a clock signal generator is not shown in Kim. However, Applicant disagrees with the notion that the mere presence of a clock signal denote the existence of a clock signal generator providing the functionality recited in claim 1. Kim does not include the clock signal generator recited in claim 1 and therefore cannot teach or suggest such a clock signal generator. Furthermore, Kim does not present a single block within any figure or any discussion of producing multiple horizontal clock signals in response to a horizontal flyback signal. The

horizontal signals in Kim are all produced outside of the circuit described (HSI and HSI2), or are produced by a controller (8) (HSI11 and HSI12) that does not operate in response to the flyback pulse (FBP) shown. (See Kim, Figure 3 and column 6, lines 19-45) Accordingly, nowhere in Kim is the limitation for producing multiple horizontal clock signals in response to the horizontal flyback signal taught or suggested in Kim, and therefore claim 1 is patentable over Kim.

Second, claim 1 further recites, "a phase selection circuit that is configured to select one of the multiple horizontal clock signals such that an edge associated with the selected multiple horizontal clock signal is non-coincident with an edge associated with the vertical flyback signal." Again, the Office Action attempts to equate the phase difference detector (18) of Kim with the phase selection circuit recited in claim 1. Applicant respectfully submits that the only similarity between the two circuits is the use of the word "phase". The claimed invention involves the positioning of an On Screen Display (OSD). If the phase of the vertical flyback signal and a horizontal signal used in displaying the OSD are aligned too closely, then jitter in the OSD can occur and may be manifested as a vertical line count error in the vertical position of the OSD. The line count error may be eliminated by selecting a horizontal signal that has a different phase. Hence, the limitation in claim 1, of "selecting one of the multiple horizontal clock signals such that an edge associated with the horizontal clock signal is non-coincident with an edge associated with the vertical flyback signal". Kim makes no mention of this functionality. In contrast, the phase difference detector (18) of Kim is directed to detecting the phase difference between the second synchronous signal HSI2 and the system clock signal CLK and outputs the detected phase difference. (Kim, column 4, lines 9-13) There is no mention in Kim, whether in connection with the phase difference detector or with any other portion of Kim, for selecting one

(3)

of multiple horizontal clock signals such that an edge associated with the selected multiple horizontal clock signal is non-coincident with an edge associated with a vertical flyback signal. Since Kim does not teach or suggest this limitation, claim 1 is patentable over Kim.

Third, Applicant agrees with the Office Action that Kim does not disclose a blanking circuit, however, Applicant disagrees that the blanking circuit of the claimed invention is "notoriously well-known" as alleged. Whether or not nomenclature such as "blanking circuit" is well known in the art to describe a category of circuits, it does not automatically mean that the blanking circuit as used in the claimed invention is also well known. The blanking circuit of the present invention is configured to "produce a blanking signal in response to the selected multiple horizontal clock signal such that the blanking signal determines the vertical position of the OSD image". With this recited functionality, Applicant offers that the blanking circuit of the claimed invention cannot be deemed "notoriously well-known". Furthermore, modifying Kim to include the blanking circuit would change the principle operation of Kim, since Kim is directed to correcting jitter components of a television system and has nothing to do with an OSD image. Additionally, there is no teaching or suggestion in Kim to add a blanking circuit to its design. Accordingly, claim 1 is patentable over Kim.

With regard to claims 2-12, claims 2-12 are dependent upon claim 1. Claims 2-11 are therefore patentable over Kim for at least the reasons stated above with respect to claim 1.

With regard to claim 13, claim 13 includes limitations that are similar to the limitations recited in claim 1. Therefore, claim 13 is patentable over Kim for at least the reasons stated above with respect to claim 1.

With regard to claims 14-18, claims 14-18 are dependent upon claim 13. Claims 14-18 are therefore patentable over Kim for at least the reasons stated above with respect to claim 13.

With regard to claim 19, claim 19 includes limitations that are similar to the limitations recited in claim 1. Therefore, claim 19 is patentable over Kim for at least the reasons stated above with respect to claim 1.

With regard to claims 20-21, claims 20-21are dependent upon claim 19. Claims 20-21 are therefore patentable over Kim for at least the reasons stated above with respect to claim 19.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, all pending claims are believed to be allowable and the application is in condition for allowance. Therefore, a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner have any further issues regarding this application, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney for the applicant at the telephone number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.

Joshua W. Korver
Registration No. 51,894
Direct Dial: 206.342.6257

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.
P. O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903
206.342.6200